Draft Email: Constructive Feedback & Curriculum Expansion Proposal for BlueDot Impact

To: BlueDot Impact AGI Strategy Team
Subject: Constructive Feedback & Perspective Expansion Proposal for the AGI Strategy Curriculum

---

Dear BlueDot Impact Team,

I hope this email finds you well.

First and foremost, I want to express my sincere appreciation for the immense work that has gone into developing the BlueDot Impact AGI Strategy course. The technical modules, threat-mapping mechanics, and risk-evaluation frameworks are remarkably well-constructed, offering students an accessible and high-leverage introduction to the technical AI safety landscape. My intention in reaching out is not to dismantle the curriculum, but rather to offer constructive feedback on the governance and strategy sections to help make the course even more comprehensive, balanced, and globally rigorous.

Recently, I authored a detailed analytical brief (*Master Brief: Deconstructing Mainstream Pedagogical Blind Spots*) examining some of the unexamined theoretical and political-economic assumptions within the current strategy units. I wanted to share a few core thoughts from that brief with your team and explain the rationale behind my approach.

1. Why a Marxist-Leninist & Materialist Lens?

A central portion of my feedback utilizes a Marxist-Leninist and historical materialist critique. I want to be entirely transparent about why I chose this specific framework: it directly responds to the curriculum's central framing of global AGI strategy as a bilateral dynamic between the two leading technological powers—the United States and the People's Republic of China.

Just as there is no single "official" or monolithic understanding of liberalism within the United States, this critique does not claim to be an official statement from the Chinese state or the CPC. Rather, historical materialism and Marxist-Leninist political economy represent the foundational analytical, economic, and philosophical framework taught, published, and utilized across Chinese academic institutions, state planning bodies, and technical institutes. To analyze Chinese state alignment, compute governance, and strategic red lines exclusively through Western national security literature (such as RAND Corporation briefs) leaves students with a one-sided view of how non-Western peer competitors actually analyze technological thresholds and material base dynamics.

2. Addressing Scope and Time Constraints

I fully anticipate and appreciate the practical counterargument regarding course design: cohort programs face real time constraints and cannot possibly cover every regional perspective or niche political philosophy around the world.

However, there is a crucial distinction when it comes to global AI strategy. Because the curriculum explicitly identifies China as a primary peer competitor and essential actor in AGI governance, omitting the primary ideological and materialist framework used by China—while maintaining the liberal market baseline of the United States—creates a noticeable pedagogical asymmetry. China, with a population greater than the entire Western world combined and a state-guided industrial model that manufactures a massive portion of the world's physical hardware, cannot be easily sidelined if a program claims to provide a truly global perspective on AI governance.

When Western strategic frameworks pathologize non-Western state industrial planning as hostile "overcapacity" while treating Western protectionist subsidies as "strategic resilience," students are deprived of the tools needed to understand international negotiation thresholds and avoid strategic miscalculation.

3. A Constructive Contribution to Governance & Strategy

I want to emphasize that my critique is targeted specifically at the governance, political economy, and strategic assumptions embedded in Units 1 through 4. The technical developments, model weight security standards, and evaluation frameworks presented in the course are excellent. My goal is simply to help complete the picture by introducing the materialist and political-economic

dimensions that govern how technology, labor, and state power interact on the global stage.

I have compiled these insights into a structured document that offers unit-by-unit mappings, historical parallels (such as historical mode transitions and the historiographical double standards surrounding state failures), and theoretical expansions on value-chain dynamics and international governance.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas further with your team, share the full document, or explore how some of these alternative strategic perspectives might be incorporated into future iterations of the reading materials or discussion prompts.

Thank you again for your dedication to building high-impact educational pipelines in AI safety, and I look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Warm regards,

[Your Name]
[Your Affiliation / Contact Information]

Attached for Reference: `BlueDotAGIStrategy.pdf` / `BlueDotAGIStrategy.md`